

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) for anticipation by Stefano Zatti "Naming in OSI" (hereinafter "Zatti"). In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 14 are independent claims. Claims 8 and 14 have been amended. Support for all amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Independent claim 8 was amended to positively claim that the codes of the URL/DNS are created from a database of pre-existing identification data. Furthermore, the claim was amended to show the present invention is directed to a method of identifying and registering applications based on pre-existing data that is commonly known to users of the Internet. Pre-existing data can be any existing database of codes known at the time, for example telephone codes. Further, the existing telephone code system composed of unique subscriber numbers, area codes, and country codes for telephone traffic is used to identify and register applications, thus allowing objects, i.e., applications to be registered for ease of location. The invention allows users to quickly search Internet information required in specific and esoteric entities, enhances knowledge exchange and greatly decreases expenditures in time and money spent to find this information.

By contrast, the cited Zatti publication discusses integrating OI (object identifier) and DN (distinguished names) and concludes, for a number of reasons, that integration of OI/DN is disadvantageous. Zatti branches off to explore alternative solutions to the problem of registering applications.

The Examiner refers Applicant to page 259, col. 2, paragraph 3, lines 17-19 of the Zatti publication for its alleged teaching of the use of existing identification codes in the notation rules. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's suggestion that Zatti teaches claim 8 directed to a method which utilizes existing codes. While the method of the Zatti publication discusses the use of OI and DN and their possible advantages, Zatti has no teaching or suggestion to use pre-existing identification data as required by claim 8.

Further, the Examiner refers Applicant to page 261, col. 1, paragraph 2, lines 1-19 of the Zatti publication for its alleged teaching of the use of formulating URL/domain name notation rules in accordance with the defined system of identification codes. Again, Zatti discusses specifically creating its own unique object identifiers based on a registration authority tree. Zatti does not discuss utilizing the existing codes, such as country codes, area codes and phone numbers. Under Zatti, each time an object name is needed, a request is made for registration to a registration authority. The registration authority then places the object in its tree and assigns a number to it. The registration then creates a unique ID and sends it back to the requester. It should be emphasized that these DN/OI codes are neither commonly known nor pre-existing. Thus, Zatti teaches away from the present invention as claimed. Under the present invention, if an object or application was created, it would have a known pre-existing code built from the existing database of ID data, whether it be a database of phone numbers or any other existing identification system. Zatti does not teach or suggest using existing Identification Codes to build URL and domain name systems.

It is important to emphasize that utilization of existing codes allows leverage of a potential registrant's knowledge of any pre-existing code system chosen to build logic into the new system. This allows potential registrants to be organized purposefully in a manner similar to the codes that were utilized. The benefit of using existing codes are many, but primarily according to the preferred embodiment, (1) language problems are obviated, and; (2) as the growth of the Internet continues, functionality can be increased and transparency ensured.

Another distinguishing feature is that the method in which the codes are used is novel because of the structure of notation rules. There is no teaching or suggestion in Zatti for notation rules, i.e., for building logic into URL's that can be easily searched and have no language dependency while still maintaining term free and value free URL's. In the present invention, there are a number of possible structures that can serve this purpose.

In other words, the method of the present invention defines a URL based on existing codes. This information resides in the URL, but it is transparent and hidden to existing systems. Systems are able to simplistically search using the notation rules and find immediately where a particular object exists. One skilled in the art can imagine the great flexibility this invention would give to creators of search engines since they would no longer be limited by foreign languages. In addition, a further benefit to the public is that the

expected further growth of the Internet would not decrease capability but rather would increase functionality and transparency, thereby increasing search options, retrievability, and equivalency.

One further important note regarding Zatti, the present invention is a unitary system, wherein Zatti is not. The Zatti publication teaches a plurality of identification systems integrated together. The benefits of a unitary system, the present invention, are numerous and overcome the disadvantages inherent in a system such as Zatti describes.

Claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8 and add further limitations thereto, are also deemed allowable over Zatti for the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 14 was amended to positively claim that the codes of the URL/DNS are created from a database of pre-existing identification data. Furthermore, the independent claim 14 was amended to show the present invention is directed to a method of identifying and registering applications based on pre-existing data that is commonly known to users of the Internet. Existing codes can be stored in any existing database of codes known at the time, for example telephone codes, and coupled to a network. Further, the existing telephone code system composed of unique subscriber numbers, area codes, and country codes for telephone traffic is used to identify and register applications, thus allowing objects, i.e., applications to be registered for ease of location. The invention allows users to quickly search Internet information required in specific and esoteric entities, enhances knowledge exchange and greatly decreases expenditures in time and money spent to find this information.

The Examiner refers Applicant to page 260, col. 1, paragraph 5, lines 1-6 of the Zatti publication for its alleged teaching of the use of existing identification codes in the notation rules. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's suggestion that Zatti teaches claim 14 directed to a system which utilizes existing codes. While the method of the Zatti publication discusses the use of OI and DN and their possible advantages and even possible integration of the two, OI and DN, it does not, however, talk about existing identification codes. Zatti does not teach "at least one database coupled to the network of servers" of existing identification codes for registering person or applications.

We respectfully ask for reconsideration of independent claim 14, which is a system claim of the same invention in independent claim 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 8-14 and formal allowance of claims 8-14 are requested. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of pending claims 8-14 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

By Jim Bosco Jr.
James J. Bosco, Jr.
Registration No. 51,489
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com